



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

my
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,532	04/30/2001	Warren M. Farnworth	97-1433.1	3740

22823 7590 02/12/2004

STEPHEN A GRATTON
THE LAW OFFICE OF STEVE GRATTON
2764 SOUTH BRAUN WAY
LAKEWOOD, CO 80228

EXAMINER

CHANG, RICK KILTAE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3729

28

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/844,532

Applicant(s)

FARNWORTH ET AL

Examiner

Rick K. Chang

Art Unit

3729

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 34-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) that are not recited in Item No. 6 below is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 34,35,38-41,43 and 49-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 27.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/23/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 34-35, 39, 43, 49 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fjelstad et al (US 5,632,631).

Fjelstad discloses providing a substrate (Fig. 4) having a surface (top of 100); forming a plurality of leads (22); etching a recess (Fig. 7 shows forming 46 by etching); forming outer layers (34); a blade (30 digs into the surface of ball 72); a conductive via (plated 46); a contact or pads (bottom 58s.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3729

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fjelstad et al (US 5,632,631) in view of Sugiyama et al (US 4,766,666).

Fjelstad fails to disclose providing a semiconductor material and anisotropic etching.

Sugiyama discloses providing a semiconductor material (30) and anisotropic etching (42 is formed by this method).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fjelstad by providing a semiconductor material and anisotropic etching, as taught by Sugiyama, for the purpose of electrically communicating between two surfaces using the semiconductive material instead of metal and the anisotropic etching allows one sided etching to form recesses.

6. Claims 40-41, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fjelstad et al (US 5,632,631) in view of Kazle (US 5,936,847).

Fjelstad fails to disclose providing a conductive polymer and a carbon film.

Kazle discloses providing a conductive polymer (140a).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fjelstad by providing a conductive polymer, as taught by Kazle, for the purpose of forming electrical communication between two electronic components without need for solder or gold.

Further, Kazle discloses providing a conductive polymer which includes a carbon film. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a carbon film, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art

Art Unit: 3729

to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice because applicants have not disclosed that a carbon film provides an advantage or solves a stated problem. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 1/23/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' arguments drawn to independent claims addressed above.

8. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the conductive polymer layers are configured to provide non bonding outer layers on the leads) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Kazle does not state that curing will form a bonding surface to the component contacts.

Conclusion


9. **Please provide reference numerals (either in parentheses next to the claimed limitation or in a table format with one column listing the claimed limitation and another column listing corresponding reference numerals in the remark section of the response to the Office Action) to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity. Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and specification of the application as**

Art Unit: 3729

originally filed requires that the applicant point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR 1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rick K. Chang whose telephone number is (703) 308-4784. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 AM to 1:30 PM, Monday through Thursday.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and (703) 872-9303 for After Final communications.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard Chang', is written over a horizontal line.

**RICHARD CHANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

RC
February 5, 2004